

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Emigh et al.(US 5,954,323). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Houseman (US 4,852,722). Claims 1 to 9 and 11 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Muller (EP 0771675A1) in view of Emigh et al. Claim 10 was objected to, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 was objected to, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the comments below withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 10 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 16

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Emigh et al.(US 5,954,323).

The Office Action admits that Emigh does not show a 360 degree rotation (page 4) but argues that a full rotation does not mean 360 degrees. The Application does not disagree with the definition of rotation as submitted. However, “full” means containing as many or as much as possible, and that means in this context all angles, i.e. all 360 degrees.

A “full rotation” means a 360 degree rotation, and this would also be clear to one of skill in the art reading the specification. See [0029] for example.

Moreover, a quick review of any art shows that “a full rotation” means 360 degrees. For example, Wikipedia defines “A degree (in full, a degree of arc, arc degree, or arcdegree), usually symbolized °, is a measurement of plane angle, representing 1/360 of a full rotation.” See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Degree_\(angle\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Degree_(angle)). This is a fairly common definition for degree, and

thus a full rotation is clearly 360 degrees. A quick Google search of the term "full rotation" shows that the term "full rotation" refers to a 360 degree rotation.

One of skill in the art reading the present application, which is the correct standard, would understand that a full rotation means a 360 degree rotation.

Withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner so desire and since the only dispute appears semantic, he specifically authorized to add the language a full 360 degree rotation into the independent claims in place of full rotation, even though this language is somewhat duplicative. Support is found for example in the fact the arm rotates a full rotation in only one direction D, and thus must rotate 360 degrees.

Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Houseman (US 4,852,722).

Again, the only issue with respect to Houseman is the definition of full rotation, and again it is respectfully submitted that Houseman does not show or teach such a full rotation.

Withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 1 to 9 and 11 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Muller (EP 0771675A1) in view of Emigh et al.


In view of the comments above, withdrawal of this rejection is also respectfully submitted as the cylinder in Emigh cannot rotate 360 degrees.

Withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940